arXiv:1401.7039v1 [physics.atom-ph] 27 Jan 2014

A proposal for sympathetically cooling neutral molecules using cold ions

F. Robicheaux
Department of Physics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907, USA
(Dated: January 29, 2014)

We describe a method for cooling neutral molecules that have magnetic and electric dipole moments using collisions with cold ions. An external magnetic field is used to split the ground rovibrational energy levels of the molecule. The highest energy state within the ground rovibrational manifold increases in energy as the distance to the ion decreases leading to a repelling potential. At low energy, inelastic collisions are strongly suppressed due to the large distance of closest approach. Thus, a collision between a neutral molecule and a cold ion will lead to a decrease in the molecule's kinetic energy with no change in internal energy. We present results for the specific case of OH molecules cooled by Be^+, Mg^+, or Ca^+ ions.

PACS numbers: 37.10.Mn, 34.50.Cx, 37.10.Pq

For over 10 years, there has been a substantial experimental effort to cool molecules to μK temperatures. This interest is sparked by the possibility of collective effects in a cold, dense molecular gas,[1, 2] interesting collisional mechanisms at low energy,[3, 4] or to enhance spectroscopic accuracy needed for precision measurements.[5, 6] A variety of techniques have been explored. Reference [7] used buffer gas cooling to trap CaH at a temperature of $\sim$ 400 mK; by a specific choice of scattering conditions, a single Ar-NO collision produced NO molecules at $\sim$ 400 mK.[8] The Stark effect has been used to slow and trap a variety of molecules with electric dipole moments.[9, 10] Reference [11] took advantage of the favorable Franck-Condon factors in SrF to perform one-dimensional laser cooling. Evaporative cooling was able to decrease the temperature of trapped OH from an initial 45 mK to 5.1 mK.[12] References [13, 14] proposed variations of a Sisyphus cooling where each photon removes a large fraction of translational energy of the molecule; the method in Ref. [13] was realized in Ref. [15] to cool CH_3F from 390 mK to 29 mK. Reference [16] was able to remove 95% of the translational energy of an O_2 beam using a "molecular coilgun". Mechanical effects, as in a spinning nozzle[17], can produce colder molecules by having the molecules exit in a moving frame of reference. This is not a complete list, but the experimental limit for cooling preexisting molecules is still above 1 mK 10 years after Ref. [18]. There are also a wide variety of theoretical proposals for cooling molecules into the ultracold regime; some examples are in Refs. [19–25].

The purpose of this paper is to describe a method to cool molecules well below 1 mK using standard cooling techniques already present in many labs while losing only a small fraction of the molecules. The basic idea is to use the collision between a neutral molecule and an ultracold positive ion for cooling the translational motion of the molecule. The specific situation we examine is the case where the molecule has both a magnetic and an electric dipole moment with the molecule in a specific internal state. The specific internal state can be achieved through the trapping process, the natural cooling near the nozzle of a molecular beam, or active cooling as in Ref. [26]. We assume the collision takes place in a uniform B-field; for molecules held in a magnetic trap, the B-field varies in space but can be considered to be uniform over distance scales that characterize the scattering with the ion. The E-field from the ion at the molecule leads to a repulsive $1/r^4$ interaction while the splitting of the energy levels due to the B-field leads to a "high" frequency scale which allows the collision to be adiabatic.



FIG. 1: The 4 largest energies of OH in a B-field of 300 G as a function of applied E-field. The solid lines are for an angle of 90° between the fields; the dotted lines are for 45°.

The essential difference between the current proposal and sympathetic cooling from atoms (e.g. Ref. [27]) is that the collisions take place at longer range which vastly increases the elastic collision rate while decreasing the rate for changing the internal state of the molecule. Our method is most similar to the sympathetic cooling of molecular ions by laser cooled atomic ions (e.g. Ref. [28]) except the long range repulsive $1/r$ interaction is replaced with a repulsive $1/r^4$ interaction; it is well known that sympathetic cooling leads to translationally cold molecular ions while leaving the internal state unchanged. All of our calculations are performed for OH molecules but we expect the basic cooling mechanism to work for other molecules as well.

Figure 1 shows how the 4 highest internal energies of OH vary with E-field strength when a 300 G B-field is also applied. The two different line types are for different angles between the fields. If the OH starts in the uppermost state, an increasing electric field causes the internal energy to increase. In a collision, the E-field from the ion at the OH increases as the distance decreases which leads to an increasing internal energy. This increasing internal energy is equivalent to a potential energy that increases with decreasing separation, i.e. a repelling force between the ion and the neutral molecule which keeps them separated. If the angle between the fields is not too close to 90°, the collision will be adiabatic and the OH will remain in the uppermost state. If there is a close approach *and* the angle is near 90°, the near degeneracy between the upper two levels could allow a transition between the states. Fortunately, if the OH and the ion have small relative kinetic energy, they will not be able to approach close enough for a transition between the states to occur. For a 300 G B-field, if the OH kinetic energy is less than 20 mK, then the inelastic cross section is 10^5 times smaller than the elastic cross section. The ratio of collision rates for different B-fields are shown in Fig. 3.

Our calculations were performed using a mixture of classical and quantum mechanics. The relative motion of the ion and molecule is treated classically. This should be a good approximation over the energy range presented here. We discuss the limitations of our calculation below and argue that the classical rates should be a good approximation down to μK temperatures. For the internal states of the molecule, we solved the full time dependent Schrödinger equation using the leapfrog algorithm. By solving the Schrödinger equation for this 8-state system, we ensure that no approximation causes the inelastic processes to be erroneously suppressed.

For the B-field strengths considered in this paper, the OH molecule has 8 internal states of interest: 4 spin states times 2 parity states. The Hamiltonian we use is the explicit form in Ref. [29] Appendix A.2 but modified to include the possibility for the electric field from the ion to *not* lie in the xz-plane. This modification is accomplished by replacing $E\cos\theta_{EB}$ with E_z, $E\sin\theta_{EB}$ with $E_x + iE_y$ in H_{16}, H_{27}, and H_{38}, and $E\sin\theta_{EB}$ with $E_x - iE_y$ in H_{25}, H_{36}, and H_{47}; the matrix elements below the diagonal are obtained from those above the diagonal by complex conjugation.

In what follows, $\vec{\psi}(t)$ is the 8-element vector holding the amplitudes of each state, $\vec{r}(t)$ is the relative position vector from the ion to the molecule, and $\vec{v}(t)$ is the relative velocity vector. We solve for both the classical and quantum dynamics using a leapfrog algorithm. For the quantum state, knowing $\vec{\psi}(t)$ and $\vec{\psi}(t-\delta t)$ and knowing the $\vec{r}(t)$ the wave function at time $t+\delta t$ is found from

$$\vec{\psi}(t+\delta t) = \vec{\psi}(t-\delta t) - 2i\delta t \underline{H}(\vec{r}(t))\vec{\psi}(t)/\hbar \qquad (1)$$

where $\underline{H}(\vec{r}(t))$ is the 8×8 matrix evaluated for the E-field arising from the separation $\vec{r}(t)$. At this point in the algorithm, the classical force can be calculated using the Hellman-Feynman theorem:

$$\vec{F}(t) = -\langle\vec{\psi}(t)|\vec{\nabla}\underline{H}(\vec{r}(t))|\vec{\psi}(t)\rangle. \qquad (2)$$

which will allow us to update the position and velocity vectors. Knowing $\vec{v}(t-\delta t/2)$ and $\vec{r}(t)$, the position and velocity at the next time step is computed from

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{v}(t+\delta t/2) &= \vec{v}(t-\delta t/2) + \vec{a}(t)\delta t \\ \vec{r}(t+\delta t) &= \vec{r}(t) + \vec{v}(t+\delta t/2)\delta t \end{aligned} \qquad (3)$$

where the acceleration $\vec{a}(t) = \vec{F}(t)/\mu$ and μ is the reduced mass. These steps are iterated, giving an algorithm that gives the motion of the particles and time evolution of the internal states.

Since we assume the ion is much colder than the molecule, the initial relative speed is the speed of the molecule. To compute the cross section, we need to have a random set of initial positions and impact parameters. We do *not* assume the initial velocity is from a specific direction because there is an external B-field which picks a specific form for the Hamiltonian. The direction of the velocity vector is chosen from a uniform sampling on the surface of a sphere. The initial position is chosen to be $\vec{r}(0) = \vec{b} - \hat{v}R$ where R is a large initial distance and $\vec{b}$ is a random point within a circle delimited by a b_{max} such that $\vec{b}\cdot\hat{v} = 0$. The initial conditions are such that we start the quantum state in the highest energy eigenstate of $\underline{H}(\vec{r}(0))$. The final time is chosen to be $2R/v$. For all parameters, we test convergence with respect to R (increasing R until the results don't change) and the b_{max} (increasing the maximum until the results don't change).

The physical parameters of interest are the inelastic and energy transfer collision rates. The inelastic collision rate is found from

$$\beta = v\pi b_{max}^2\langle 1 - P_8\rangle \qquad (4)$$

where $P_8 = |\langle\vec{\psi}_8|\vec{\psi}(t_f)|^2$ is the probability the molecule is still in the highest energy *eigenstate* at the final time, t_f. The energy transfer collision rate is found from

$$\eta = v\pi b_{max}^2\langle KE_i - KE_f\rangle/KE_i \qquad (5)$$

where KE_i is the initial kinetic energy of the molecule and KE_f is the final kinetic energy of the molecule. To find the final kinetic energy of the molecule, we use center of mass coordinates: $\vec{v} = \vec{v}_m - \vec{v}_i$ and $\vec{V} = (M_m\vec{v}_m + M_i\vec{v}_i)/(M_m + M_i)$ where the m, i subscripts refer the molecule or ion respectively. The final velocity of the molecule is found from $\vec{v}_{m,f} = \vec{V} + M_i\vec{v}(t_f)/(M_m + M_i)$ where $\vec{v}(t_f)$ is the final relative velocity from the calculation and the center of mass velocity $\vec{V}$ is a conserved quantity. From these rates, we can solve for the rate of kinetic energy lost by the molecule and the rate of population lost if we know the density of ions. Taken as average quantities: $dP/dt = -n\beta P$ and $dKE/dt = -n\eta KE$



FIG. 2: The energy loss rate, η, and population loss rate, β, for neutral OH molecules colliding with cold Mg^+ ions. The ions are assumed to be much colder than the molecules and KE is the kinetic energy of the molecules. The OH are assumed to start in their highest internal state in a B-field of 100 G (solid line), 200 G (dotted line), 300 G (dashed line), and 400 G (dash-dot line).



FIG. 3: The ratio of parameters for Fig. 2; the line types are the same as Fig. 2.

where n is the ion density, P is the population of trapped molecules and KE is the average kinetic energy.

Figure 2 shows the rates as a function of OH kinetic energy for the case where the ion is Mg^+. For these parameters, the energy loss rate is higher than the inelastic collision rate over the whole energy range except for the 100 G case. Another obvious feature is that the inelastic collisions are more suppressed as the B-field is increased, and the inelastic rate has a threshold which is at larger KE as the B-field increases. Both effects are because the collisions become more adiabatic as the splitting from the B-field increases. Most importantly, the energy loss rate, η, is approximately constant which results from the fact that the repelling potential is approximately $1/r^4$. For a classical Hamiltonian with a pure $1/r^4$ potential, there is an exact scaling of any length ($L \propto 1/KE^{1/4}$) and speed ($v \propto KE^{1/2}$). Thus, classical rates, vL^2, do not depend on KE. The smallest KE calculated is 1 mK; see below for a discussion of the rates at smaller KE.

Figure 3 shows the ratio of population loss rate divided by the energy loss rate for different B-fields. From this plot, it's clear that the inelastic collisions become completely unimportant as energy is removed from the molecules. As an interesting point of comparison, the ratio is 0.1 for OH kinetic energies of 22, 46, 66, and 90 mK for the 100, 200, 300, and 400 G B-fields. The ratio is 0.01 for OH kinetic energies of 13, 26, 39, and 51 mK. The kinetic energy at which the ratio reaches a specific low value approximately scales with the B-field.

Figure 4 shows the rates as a function of OH kinetic energy for the case of 300 G for Be^+, Mg^+, and Ca^+. There is the interesting trend that the inelastic collision rate is smaller and the energy loss rate is larger as the ion mass decreases. This trend is not surprising. For lighter ions, the energy transfer rate increases because it is easier to accelerate ion. For lighter ions, the distance of closest approach is larger (for the same reason) which suppresses the inelastic rate.

An important question is how many ions will be needed to produce substantial cooling. *The limiting factor is the inelastic collision between two molecules.* Reference [30] (Fig. 4) has an inelastic rate at 0 V/cm of $\sim 4\times10^{-10}$ cm^3/s for 500 G and 50 mK, $\sim 1\times10^{-11}$ cm^3/s for 500 G and 1 mK, and $\sim 1\times10^{-11}$ cm^3/s for 500 G and 1 μK. These rates are much smaller than those in Figs. 2 and 4 because the interaction distance is smaller for the OH-OH collisions. If the molecules and ions are equally distributed with an energy $\sim$ 50 mK, then there can be somewhat less than 1 ion per 200 molecules. Note that once the molecule energy is $\sim$ 1 mK or less, then there can be approximately 1 ion per 10,000 molecules. In Ref. [12], they estimate a peak density of OH of $\sim 5\times10^{10}$ cm^{-3} with $\sim 10^6$ molecules. For these parameters, sympathetic cooling should be effective with less than 10,000 ions and, perhaps, with as few as 100.

One important question is the energy dependence of the energy loss rate, η, for energies below 1 mK. To get an idea, we performed a quantum calculation for the energy loss rate for a repelling $1/r^4$ potential. The actual



FIG. 4: Similar to Fig. 2, except all lines are for 300 G. The difference is the solid line is for OH collisions with ^{9}Be$^+$, ^{24}Mg$^+$, and ^{40}Ca$^+$. This shows lighter ions do a better job cooling the OH molecules although the difference is not qualitative.

potential depends on both r and $\cos\theta$ but we can obtain the trend with respect to energy just from the isotropic interaction. We fit the dependence of the highest energy eigenstate as a function of E-field and the angle with respect to the B-field. For low field strengths, the energy can be written as

$$\epsilon_8 = \epsilon_8(E=0) + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_0 + \alpha_2 P_2(\cos\theta))E^2 \qquad (6)$$

where P_2 is a Legendre polynomial, $\alpha_0 = 7.5 \times 10^{-10}$ mK/(V/m)^2, and $\alpha_2 = 7.0 \times 10^{-10}$ mK/(V/m)^2. For the quantum scattering calculation, we set $\alpha_2 = 0$ and used a potential C_4/r^4 with $C_4 = (\alpha_0/2)(e/4\pi\varepsilon_0)^2$. The scattering could be treated using a method analogous to Ref. [31], but, instead, we numerically solved the radial Schrödinger equation using a Numerov algorithm.

The quantum energy loss rate, η, changed by less than 1% between 10 mK and 10 nK which is the behavior expected from *classical* scaling. The energy loss rate is

$$\eta \propto v \int_{-1}^{1} (1-\cos\theta)\frac{d\sigma}{d\cos\theta} d\cos\theta \qquad (7)$$

with the proportionality constant independent of energy. As the energy decreases, the cross section decreases but the differential cross section is less strongly peaked at $\cos\theta = 1$. The near constant quantum rate for the isotropic potential suggests the energy loss rate $\eta \sim 10^{-7}$cm^3/s for the full potential down to ~ 10 nK.

We have not found a mechanism due to the ion collisions that would prevent the molecules from reaching degeneracy. One possible experimental arrangement could have the ions in a smaller spatial region than the cold molecules at $\sim$ 10's mK. The density of molecules increases as the temperature decreases proportional to $1/T^{3/2}$. In going from 50 mK to 1 mK, the OH density increases by a factor of a few hundred but the inelastic collision rate between two OH molecules also decreases by a factor of a few tens which means the rate of losing molecules does not increase proportional to the density. An ion density $\sim 1/1,000$ that of the target OH density would lead to OH temperatures substantially below 1 mK. Thus, the space charge of the ions would be a minor perturbation. After cooling, the ions can be removed from the trap without disturbing the cold molecules.

We have performed calculations of collisions between an OH molecule and a cold positive ion in a magnetic field. We find that the collision is adiabatic at low temperature which means the inelastic cross section is exponentially suppressed at low energy. We presented results for 100, 200, 300, and 400 G B-fields and found that the cooling behavior is more favorable for larger fields. The limitation to the cooling will be the inelastic collision between pairs of OH molecules. Since this inelastic collision rate also decreases rapidly with decreasing temperature, it seems likely that a small fraction of cold, positive ions could sympathetically cool neutral molecules. The lower bound on the OH temperature can not be estimated from the data in this paper but we expect it to be well below 1 mK. Because the mechanism that suppresses the inelastic ion-molecule collision is a generic property of perturbed quantum systems, the results in this paper should be generally applicable for neutral molecules with magnetic and electric dipole moments. Furthermore, since the inelastic molecule-molecule transition is due to a shorter range interaction, it seems likely that cooling will be possible for many, if not most, molecules with magnetic and electric dipole moments.

We thank C.H. Greene for pointing out relevant earlier work and insightful conversations. This work was supported by the Office of Basic Energy Sciences, U.S. Department of Energy.

[1] K. Goral, L. Santos, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 170406 (2002).

[2] A. Micheli, G.K. Brennen, and P. Zoller, Nature Phys.

2, 341 (2006).
[3] R.V. Krems, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **10**, 4079 (2008).
[4] P.S. Zuchowski and J.M. Hutson, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 062708 (2009).
[5] E.A. Hinds, Phys. Scr. T **70**, 34 (1997).
[6] J. J. Hudson, D. M. Kara, I. J. Smallman, B. E. Sauer, M. R. Tarbutt, and E. A. Hinds, Nature **473**, 493 (2011).
[7] J.D. Weinstein, R. deCarvalho, T. Guillet, B. Friedrich, and J.M. Doyle, Nature **395**, 148 (1998).
[8] M.S. Elioff, J.J. Valentini, and D.W. Chandler, Science **302**, 1940 (2003).
[9] S.Y.T. van de Meerakker, et al, H.L. Bethlem, and G. Meijer, Nature Phys. **4**, 595 (2008).
[10] S. Chervenkov, X. Wu, J. Bayerl, A. Rohlfes, T. Gantner, M. Zeppenfeld, and G. Rempe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 013001 (2014).
[11] E.S. Shuman, J.F. Barry, and D. DeMille, Nature **467**, 820 (2010).
[12] B.K. Stuhl, M.T. Hummon, M. Yeo, G. Quemener, J.L. Bohn, and J. Ye, Nature **492**, 396 (2012).
[13] M. Zeppenfeld, M. Motsch, P. W. H. Pinkse, and G. Rempe, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 041401(R) (2009).
[14] F. Robicheaux, J. Phys. B **42**, 195301 (2009).
[15] M. Zeppenfild, B.G.U. Englert, R. Glockner, A. Prehn, M. Mielenz, C. Sommer, L.D. van Buuren, M. Motsch, and G. Rempe, Nature **491**, 570 (2012).
[16] E. Narevicius, A. Libson, C.G. Parthey, I. Chavez, J. Narevicius, U. Even, and M.G. Raizen, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 051401(R) (2008).
[17] M. Gupta and D. Herschbach, J. Phys. Chem. A **105**, 1626 (2001).
[18] Special issue on cold molecules edited by J. Doyle, B. Friedrich, R.V. Krems, and F. Masnou-Seeuws [Eur. Phys. J. D **31**, 149 (2004)], and references therein.
[19] K. Takase, L.A. Rahn, D.W. Chandler, and K.E. Strecker, New J. Phys. **11**, 055033 (2009).
[20] P. Barletta, J. Tennyson, and P.F. Barker, New J. Phys. **12**, 113002 (2010).
[21] S.K. Tokunaga, W. Skomorowski, P.S. Zuchowski, R. Moszyski, J.M. Hutson, E.A. Hinds, and M.R. Tarbutt, Eur. Phys. J. D **65**, 141 (2011).
[22] A.O.G. Wallis, E.J.J. Longdon, P.S. Zuchowski, and J.M. Hutson, Eur. Phys. J. D **65**, 151 (2011).
[23] B.L. Lev, A. Vukics, E.R. Hudson, B.C. Sawyer, P. Domokos, H. Ritsch, and J. Ye, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 023402 (2008).
[24] Z. Idziaszek, T. Calarco, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 053413 (2011).
[25] A.O.G. Wallis and J.M. Hutson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 183201 (2009).
[26] I. Manai, R. Horchani, H. Lignier, P. Pillet, D. Comparat, A. Fioretti, and M. Allegrini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 183001 (2012).
[27] M. Lara, J.L. Bohn, D. Potter, P. Soldan, and J.M. Hutson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 183201 (2006).
[28] X. Tong, A.H. Winney, and S. Willitsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 143001 (2010).
[29] B.K. Stuhl, M. Yeo, B.C. Sawyer, M.T. Hummon, and J. Ye, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 033427 (2012).
[30] G. Quemener and J.L. Bohn, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 012706 (2013).
[31] S. Watanabe and C.H. Greene, Phys. Rev. A **22**, 158 (1980).